

ATTACHMENT A

Remarks

By this Amendment, certain allowable subject matter of the dependent claims have been rewritten in independent form to make all pending claims allowable, while claims 2 and 44 have been canceled. New formal drawings with the examiner requested corrections are also submitted herewith. It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

In the *Drawings* section of the Detailed Action, the drawings were objected to for containing terms in the French language. As suggested by the examiner to overcome this objection, these extraneous terms have been deleted, with these changes thus included in the replacement formal drawings now provided in Attachment C. It will be noted that an obvious numbering correction in figure 2I has also been corrected as noted.

In the *Priority* section of the Action, the examiner again acknowledged applicant's claim for foreign priority, but noted that no certified copy of the foreign priority document had been filed since such was not listed on PCT/DO/EP/903, and such was not forwarded by the International Bureau. However, the certified copy was timely filed (authorized to be obtained by the RO with the initial Request) in the international stage application, as evidenced by the copy of PCT/IB/304 provided herewith in Attachment D. Thus, a copy of PCT/IB/304 for this US national stage application should have been present in the file forwarded by the International Bureau (which PCT/IB/304 meets the requirement in the US for the filing of the priority document in the US national stage

application), and this copy provided by applicant thus now serves as evidence thereof (of both the timely submission of the certified copy and of its receipt by the IB).

Consequently, it is submitted that either (1) this copy supplied by applicant should be used in the present US national stage application to evidence the proper and timely filing of the certified copy in the international stage application and hence in this application, or (2) a copy of PCT/IB/304 should be obtained from the IB by the US Patent Office. Thus, applicant's claim for priority should now, or after obtaining of the PCT/IB/304 from the IB, be perfected.

However, if applicant's copy of PCT/IB/304 is not sufficient and if the examiner is unable to obtain a copy of this PCT/IB/304 from the IB, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that another certified copy of the priority document can be obtained and submitted by applicant in this application.

In the *Claims Objections* section, claims 1, 20, 25, 41, 42, 45, 46, and 49 were objected to because of informalities. The noted informalities of claims 1, 41, 42, 45, and 46 have been attended to by this presentation of the claims - as the undesired underlinings are now removed as requested, no changes therefor are evident in these claims.

No reason was given by the examiner for objection to claims 20, 25 and 49. The examiner is thus invited to telephone the undersigned if there is any remaining objections to these claims so that they can be quickly and simply corrected.

It will be noted that claim 20 may have been objected to since the previously underlined "d" was shown as being deleted by strikethrough thereof; which on its face might have seemed incongruent when appearing as "d" – and thus ambiguously as

either a deleted “underlined d” (as would be evident from the previous version of the claim), or as an added “strikethrough d” (which would be inconsistent with the previous version of the claim). In the present listing of the claims, this incongruity is avoided since all previous claim changes are now effected.

It will also be noted that claim 25 may have been objected to due to the use of “type”. By this Amendment, the usage of this term is now avoided.

In view of all of the above, it is submitted that the objections to the claims (except claim 49 discussed below) have been overcome.

In the *Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 112* rejection, claim 49 was rejected for being indefinite for use of the terminology “such as ...” as noted. Presumably, this is also the cause of the unexplained objection to claim 49 (as noted above). By this Amendment, the objected to phrase has been deleted from claim 49, so that the rejection under § 112 and presumably the objection thereto have now been overcome.

In the *Claims Rejection – 35 USC § 102* section and in the *Claims Rejection – 35 USC § 103* section, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3-6, 8-11, 14-16, 20-21, 24-25, 34-36, 44, 47 and 49 were rejected as being anticipated by the Ellis patent or unpatentable over the Ellis patent with or without the use of additional references. However, in the initial *Allowable Subject Matter* section, dependent claims 2, 7, 12-13, 17-19, 22, 26-33, 37-43, 45-46 and 48 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. This indication of allowable subject matter is appreciated.

In response to this indication of allowable subject matter, independent claim 1 has now been revised to include the allowable subject of dependent claim 2 (now

canceled). Thus, amended independent claim 1, as well as claims 4-12, 14-25, 34-40, 42-43, 45 and 47-49 dependent therefrom, are now all allowable.

In addition, the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 13 has now been rewritten in independent form. Thus, amended independent claim 13, as well as claim 3 dependent therefrom, are now allowable.

Further, the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 26 has also now been rewritten in independent form. Thus, amended independent claim 26, as well as claims 27-33, 41 and 46 dependent therefrom, are now allowable.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is solicited.